DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 771 UD 018 396

TITLE	Research Review of Equal Education. Inequality in Israeli Education.
INSTITUTION	Northwestern Univ., Evanston, Ill. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	39p.
JOURNAL CIT	Research Review of Equal Education; v2 n1 1978
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Arabs; Cultural Factors; Economic Factors; *Educational Opportunities; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; *Jews; *Public Education; School Integration; Social Background; State of the Art Reviews
IDENTIFIERS	*Israel

ABSTRACT

In this collection of brief articles, the sources of inequality in Israeli education are examined. The economic and social background of students are discussed. The Minkovich Report, "An Evaluation Study of Israeli Elementary Schools," is reviewed. Arab education in Israel is examined. Integration in Israeli schools is discussed. Financial inequality in education is examined. Interviews with Israelis working in the field of education are reported. Statistics are provided to illustrate specific points of view. It is concluded that factors outside the school system are crucial to an understanding of inequality in Israeli education. (Author/AC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED156771

RESEARCH REVIEW OF EQUAL EDUCATION

UDO 18396

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

2

Winter 1978

Volume 2, No. 1/Winter 1978

Meyer Weinberg, Editor
Gertrude Martin, Editorial associate
Dan Weinberg, Business manager
Joyce Mirza, Research assistant
Carol Naughton, Design
Sarge Ruck, Development Director

Published quarterly by the Center for Equal Education,
School of Education, Northwestern University,
2003 Sheridan Road, Evanston, Illinois 60201.
Phone: 312/492-9465.

US ISSN 912008-14-8

Subscription rates:

1 year $15.00
2 years $28.00
3 years $38.00
(Add $1.50 per year for foreign postage)
Single copy: $4.00 plus postage:
30c domestic 40c foreign

Publication of the **Research Review of Equal Education** is made possible by a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The views expressed herein are solely those of the authors and no endorsement or support from the National Institute of Education and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is intended or should be inferred.

RESEARCH REVIEW OF EQUAL EDUCATION

Inequality in Israeli Education

3	Economic and Social Background
5	The Minkovich Report
12	Arab Education in Israel
17	Integration in Israeli Schools
23	Education and Financial Inequality
24	Interviews with Israelis
29	Concluding Observations
31	Tables

Works Cited 35

Inequality in Israeli Education

Public education in Israel embodies two contradictory trends that will be familiar to observers of the American scene: (1) goals of universal access and achievement are proclaimed but (2) the structures of public education persistently produce unequal results for various groups in the society. The sources of these inequalities are complex. They lie both within and beyond the school system itself. The external factors, however, are crucial.

Economic and Social Backgrounds

Israel is a country of some 3.7 million persons, 84 percent of whom are Jews. Almost all the rest are Arabs; a few non-Arab Christians live in the country. At the end of 1976, the country's 3.02 million Jews were of the following origins:[1]

	Number	Percent
Israeli-born of Israeli-born father	333,400	11.0
Born in Asian-African country	648,800	21.5
Born in European-American country	796,700	26.4
Israeli-born of father born in Asian-African country	746,200	24.7
Israeli-born of father born in European-American country	494,900	16.4
	3,020,400	100.0

The non-Jewish population was as follows:

Muslims	429,100	77.3
Christians	82,000	14.8
Druzes and others	43,900	7.9
	555,000	100.0

Thus, the *Sephardim* or Oriental Jews (of Asian-African origin) slightly outnumber the *Ashkenazim* or Western Jews (of European-American origin). The Druze, who are culturally Arabs, form a special group in the society.

1. *Statistical Abstract of Israel 1977* (Tel Aviv: Central Bureau of Statistics, November 1977), p. 45 (Hereafter referred to as *SAOI 1977*).

Economic stratification is another fundamental characteristic of Israeli society. The stratification corresponds to ethnic divisions in great part. A survey of net income during 1975-1976 found the following array, by income decile:[2]

	Place of Father's Birth-Jews			
Decile	Asia-Africa	Europe-America	Israel	Non-Jews
10	5.7	70.2	24.1	–
9	8.9	61.2	29.6	0.3
8	17.0	54.6	28.4	–
7	19.6	52.3	27.7	0.4
6	33.5	46.7	17.7	2.1
5	33.5	44.9	18.0	3.6
4	45.3	39.0	13.9	1.8
3	45.1	35.0	14.3	5.6
2	47.8	32.6	10.2	9.4
1	55.5	18.3	8.7	17.5

Clearly, some persons from each group can be found at nearly every step on the economic ladder. At the same time, place of origin influences economic position. Period of immigration – not shown above – is also of importance. As a group, Jews who came to Israel only recently are considerably lower on the socioeconomic scale.

In Israel, education is closely related to the distribution of income. Here is a compilation showing the interrelation of years of education completed by income decile:[3]

Income	Years of Schooling Completed					
Decile	0	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-15	16+
10	0.9	0.3	9.3	36.8	20.0	32.7
9	–	1.7	9.5	37.9	18.9	32.0
8	1.6	2.3	14.6	41.2	19.5	20.8
7	2.4	3.2	22.5	40.2	16.1	15.6
6	2.4	4.1	23.9	45.4	12.8	11.4
5	5.2	3.0	29.2	46.2	7.9	8.5
4	5.1	6.6	37.1	38.3	7.9	5.0
3	5.2	9.7	43.5	31.5	4.9	5.2
2	15.4	12.4	44.7	17.8	5.5	4.2
1	19.5	14.0	41.5	17.2	5.7	2.0
Total	5.8	5.7	27.6	35.3	11.9	13.7

The relative lack of education among the poor is noteworthy although some few in these groups have found their way to the universities. The wealthiest groups are heavily represented in the highest educational ranks.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 267. These figures were reported by "net income per standard adult."
3. *Ibid.*

6

Family size is strongly influenced by ethnic origin and education. The number of persons in a household varies with place of birth, as follows:[4]

Place of Birth	Percent of Households: 3 persons in household	7 or more persons in household
Born in Asia-Africa	12.7	18.4
Israel-born, father born in Asia-Africa	21.8	7.4
Born in Europe-America	18.9	1.2
Israeli-born, father born in Europe-America	22.3	1.4

Similarly, the number of children in the family who attended primary schools during 1976-1977 was as follows, in percentages:[5]

Number of Children	Ethnic Origin: European-American	Asian-African	Israeli
1-2	41.7	12.1	32.4
3	34.9	23.0	40.5
4	13.2	19.7	16.6
5-6	7.2	21.9	7.8
7+	3.0	23.2	2.7

It should be noted that nearly one of eight of all Asian-African families had only one or two primary school children and that one out of thirty-three European-American families had seven or more children attending primary school. Of interest, also, is the fact that Asian-African origin households are distinctly smaller when the children were born in Israel.

These socioeconomic data provide a setting for understanding inequalities in Israeli education. Let us examine the operation of the schools within such a setting.

The Minkovich Report

In mid-1977, *An Evaluation Study of Israeli Elementary Schools* was published in preliminary form. It was written by a group of Hebrew University researchers, A. Minkovich, D. Davis, and J. Bashi.[6] It is the most comprehensive such study yet made: students surveyed numbered 17,700; 614 classrooms in 98 schools were covered. Grades included first, second, fourth, and sixth. "Our aim," writes Minkovich, "is to obtain as clear a picture as possible of existing conditions in elementary schools and of the school's impact on students from different cultural backgrounds."[7] Future publications are to contain analyses of various aspects of the schools.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 53. 5. *Ibid.*, p. 613.
6. The study was supported by the Bernard van Leer Foundation, the Israeli Ministry of Education, and Hebrew University.
7. Minkovich and others, *An Evaluation Study*, p. 25.

In the present report, certain background information was gathered by the Minkovich team. The usual categories, "Asian-African" and "European-American," were broken down into seven subdivisions, each one suggestive of a special educational problem. The degree of parent education varied greatly among origin-groups. There was almost a five-year difference in educational attainment between first generation Asian-African (AA) parents and second generation European-American (EA) parents. Almost all the children with parents who had less than four years of schooling were first generation AA. Almost all of this latter group of children are enrolled in state-supported religious schools, or schools with 75 percent or more disadvantaged, or schools located in socioeconomically and ethnically homogeneous new towns and villages.

The Minkovich group looked into family and home conditions. Children with the least-schooled parents tended also to live in the largest families and the most crowded housing. Unlike similar families in the U.S., families of these children did not tend to be disorganized or lacking in one parent. Most children reported having private study facilities at home. Children in least-educated families were less likely (47 percent) than better-educated families (84 percent) to see their parents reading. The same was more or less true of opportunities for family verbal interactions. Yet, even in families whose head had received no schooling, two-thirds of the children reported they received help at home in doing homework. Parental encouragement to complete elementary school did not vary among educational and ethnic groups. Better-educated parents, however, wanted their children to attend a university while less-educated ones spoke in terms of a trade school or completing high school.

Nursery schools and cultural participation comprised learning activities outside home and school. "Even with the Ministry of Education's efforts to increase the attendance of disadvantaged children in nursery schools," report the researchers, "the most advantaged children . . . come to compulsory kindergarten [at the age of five] with almost two years of nursery school experience compared to one year for the most disadvantaged children . . ."[8] Children in more disadvantaged families are also less likely to be engaged in some learning activity outside school such as dancing and music.

This "gloomy" picture, as the researchers characterize it, is, in part, amenable to change. They point to factors such as nurseries, the availability of books, and family interest and help. In this regard, they stress the importance of working through older siblings who are more likely to have advanced beyond their parents' schooling level.

To what degree do students in all schools receive an equal share of school facilities, programs, and staff? Schools were classified into

8. *Ibid.*, p. 84.

three groups to facilitate reporting data: (a) disadvantaged schools: those enrolling 76 percent or more disadvantaged children; (b) advantaged schools: those enrolling less than 25 percent disadvantaged children; and (c) integrated schools: those with 25-75 percent disadvantaged children.

In terms of staff and class size, the Minkovich team observed that more of each per student was used in disadvantaged than in advantaged schools. "It should be noted," add the researchers, ". . . that part of the increased staff hours per student in disadvantaged schools is for specialized treatment classes which affect only a small percent of the students."[9]

A distinct disparity was found in the allocation of facilities and equipment: ". . . Schools with many disadvantaged children have poorer facilities, equipment, and supplies, despite the prevalent belief that these schools get 'special treatment'."[10] Only 27 percent of disadvantaged schools had a library room; 59 percent of the advantaged schools had such a room. The average number of books per student in the two types of schools was three and five. Disadvantaged schools fared especially poorly in the matter of special-purpose rooms (for nurses, counselors, and others).

Compensatory programs are found more frequently in disadvantaged schools. The researchers found ability grouping most prevalent in integrated schools (79 percent), less so in disadvantaged schools (65 percent), and least so in advantaged schools (32 percent). "The high frequencies," according to the researchers, "are a sign of the Ministry of Education's policy of concern toward the disadvantaged child."[11] Less than a quarter of children in disadvantaged schools were receiving homework help; the researchers feel this figure and other, even lower ones, indicate that "these compensatory activities are not meeting the needs of all types of schools, especially disadvantaged schools."[12]

An extended school day program, designed especially for disadvantaged schools and financed wholly by the Ministry of Education, was found only in 66 percent of disadvantaged schools.

Parent participation programs were found to be distributed in a seriously disparate manner. Such programs were found in only 14 percent of disadvantaged schools but in 46 percent of advantaged schools. Yet, observe the researchers, "educators and researchers have emphasized this subject as one of the main factors influencing the progress of disadvantaged children."[13] New curricula and instructional methods were found more frequently in advantaged than in disadvantaged schools. Inservice training programs for teachers were found in 67 percent of the former but in only 28 percent of the latter.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 96. 10. *Ibid.*, p. 101. 11. *Ibid.*, p. 105. 12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*

Actually, researchers observe, activities designed as compensatory, i.e., over and above what is received by all students, turn out not to compensate but, at best, to match funds in other schools. Ministry of Education funds pay for compensatory programs in disadvantaged schools. In advantaged schools, however, contributions by parents and by local municipalities seem to match the national government's expenditures in disadvantaged schools. In effect, therefore, children in the latter schools receive only "as much" rather than "more." (In a real sense, since their needs are greater, "as much" is quite "less.") This underscores the researchers' observation that "except for Ministry of Education programs, there is little educational activity initiated by the disadvantaged schools or by other agencies in their behalf."[14]

With reference to the availability of special services in the schools, it was found that "children in disadvantaged schools have significantly less access to doctors, psychologists and counseling-teachers . . ." Of the relative unavailability of counseling-teachers, the researchers write: "It is discouraging that this service, which is intended mainly for disadvantaged pupils, is more prevalent in advantaged and integrated schools."[15] In another place, the general problem was termed "disturbing," and the disadvantaged schools were labeled "inferior" in a number of respects.[16]

Principals and teachers were an important focus of the study. In terms of professional training, staff participation in in-service training, and turnover, both principals and teachers in disadvantaged schools were very different. Whereas 52 percent of the principals of disadvantaged schools were of Asian-African origin, none of the principals of advantaged schools was.

Principals in disadvantaged schools had least personal contact with students, parents, and staff. The same held true for time spent in planning extracurricular activities. Principals in disadvantaged schools were also likely to spend more time on physical maintenance. While 85 and 65 percent of principals in advantaged and integrated schools wish to continue in their present position, only 44 percent of principals in disadvantaged schools expressed a like attitude. Most principals in all types of schools, however, express satisfaction with their job.

Teachers in advantaged schools were more likely to view their work with parents as potentially helpful to the child's learning. The researchers warn of a self-fulfilling prophecy by such teachers: "While many disadvantaged parents cannot help with homework, appropriate directions might lead these parents to utilize other sources of help, such as older brothers, neighbors, paid tutors . . . But a teacher who does not believe that parents can help the child's academic progress will probably turn to the parents only with disciplinary problems and

14. *Ibid.*, p. 109. 15. *Ibid.*, p. 111. 16. *Ibid.*, p. 113.

not with academic matters."[17] At the same time, teachers generally had exceedingly low academic expectations for the disadvantaged: "Only ten percent . . . expect that most of the disadvantaged would succeed even with maximal educational inputs."[18]

Nevertheless, teachers evaluate their own teaching as successful even when they work with disadvantaged students. The researchers point out certain contradictions in the self-evaluations. For example, "76 percent of the teachers in disadvantaged schools feel that the disadvantaged child is inattentive in class and does not concentrate while . . . 61 percent report success in fostering their pupils' motivation and curiosity."[19] An indication of dissatisfaction among teachers in disadvantaged schools is the fact that one-tenth wish to change their profession and another third want to transfer to another school. In advantaged schools, the proportions are one-twentieth for both options. As Minkovich and colleagues see it, the teachers tend to blame the student and/or parents for negative outcomes and thus maintain their self-concepts as adequate teachers. This view is offered tentatively by the researchers.

Students' self-conceptions and aspirations were also probed. On measurements of locus of control – i.e., the degree to which one feels personally in control of one's future – disadvantaged students tended more to attribute success or failure to external events and forces. Student anxiety about academic success was highest among the more disadvantaged groups. Student self-image among the same groups was on the low side. Yet, the most disadvantaged students had the highest relative expectations for good academic grades; these expectations were contradicted by everyday experience in the classroom. The same was true of aspirations for further schooling and life success.

A major part of the Minkovich investigation dealt with academic achievement. This was tested, however, in a novel way. Customarily, a standardized achievement test is constructed and administered. Results are reported in a way that informs us only as to the relative position of a student – above or below the mean score, for example. The Minkovich group went further. It sought to determine the *quality* of the achievement. Instead of general achievement tests, instruments were constructed in five subject matter areas that are taught universally in the primary schools: language, arithmetic, geography, science, and Bible.

Qualitative achievement was ascertained by two criteria. In the case of individual students, 60 and 70 percent correct became the "lenient" and "stringent" measures. Group achievement was measured in a much more complex way:[20]

> Every group will be considered to have achieved adequately if at least 75 percent of the pupils satisfy the lenient criterion

17. *Ibid.*, p. 133. 18. *Ibid.*, p. 138. 19. *Ibid.* 20. *Ibid.*, p. 185.

requirements . . . and 50 percent of this subgroup also satisfy the more stringent criterion requirements . . . If 75 percent of the pupils satisfy the more lenient requirement but fewer than 50 percent satisfy the more stringent requirement, the group will be in a position of partial mastery. A group that fails to meet even these criteria will be considered as having failed. Criteria for group mastery are then defined by three cutoff points: the top half has to attain a grade of at least 70 percent ("fair"); the next quartile a grade of at least 60-69 percent ("pass"); and the lowest quartile, grades lower than 59 percent ("poor" or "unsatisfactory").

Use of criterion measures adds a degree of realism to the inquiry. Thus, potentially at least, it increases the practical consequences that may follow.

The researchers found that country of origin was a powerful determinant of achievement, even when education of parents was held constant. In all the tests and grades, first generation Asian-African children were lowest and second generation European-Americans were highest. Second generation children of all groups scored higher than first generation children. No evidence was found to support the contention that disadvantaged groups, in general, experience a cumulative cognitive deficit.

Within the first generation Asian-African group, the language achievement of more than two out of five sixth grade students is classed as "highly unsatisfactory." Children of families in which the head of the household had received no schooling had an even more disturbing record: three out of five could not meet even the "lenient" criterion of success on language tests. On the same language tests, researchers found limited evidence of a cumulative learning gap for children of first generation Asian-Africans. Their language disability grew to two years by the end of sixth grade. (This involves a comparison with first generation European-Americans.) An even larger growth of the achievement gap was found in mathematics tests between groups of contrasting socioeconomic status. A one-year gap in second grade grew to two years or more by the end of sixth grade.

While the Bible is very widely taught in Israeli schools, the general level of achievement in this subject is apparently quite low. This was found to be the case with specific factual content contained in the Bible. This was less true for state religious schools whose students, more disadvantaged and Asian-African than state secular schools, nevertheless scored from 5-10 percent higher on such test items. These schools take the Bible more seriously, in a real sense. They spend more time on it and are supported strongly by religious parents. To the researchers, this experience yields a more generally applicable lesson: ". . . The increase of teacher hours combined with positive attitudes in school and home may have great effects on

advantaged as well as disadvantaged children in their studies in particular subjects."[21] Still, it was puzzling for the researchers to discover also that Bible achievement in the schools was lower than that for mathematics.

Geographical knowledge is very unevenly distributed in the schools although, in general, there is a meager amount offered. Fourth grade geography achievement is lower than that for any other subject matter area. For the schools as a whole, mastery of geography altogether eludes one-seventh of first generation European-Americans, two-fifths of first generation Asian-Africans, and three fifths of children whose parents are unschooled. Even by sixth grade, some 70 percent of Asian-African children are unable to meet even the lenient criteria of success in map-reading.

Science achievement, as a whole, was unsatisfactory, especially with respect to material that had not been studied in an earlier grade. The schools had an especially dismal treatment of anatomy and inorganic phenomena in the science curriculum. Nearly three-quarters of first generation Asian-African children and nearly half of first generation European-Americans failed to achieve a "pass" level on this material. Between grades four and six, the achievement gap between different origin and education groups did not grow.

How did academic achievement, as a whole, vary with type of school (advantaged, integrated, and disadvantaged) and form of organization (state-secular and state-religious)? The percent of disadvantaged students enrolled was as follows, by type of school:[22]

43	In schools in the study
10	In advantaged schools
92	In disadvantaged schools
47	In integrated schools

This classification is based on a new official definition of disadvantaged adopted in 1974:

> Eighth graders . . . were divided into four groups according to their father's country or origin . . . Each group was then subdivided according to five categories of father's educational level. Each of these subgroups was then finally classified into seven categories according to the number of children in the family.

Achievement test scores of the children were taken from a now-discontinued test battery offered at the end of the eighth grade.

The researchers found a very high correlation between these test results and the elements of the new definition of disadvantage. The achievement gap between advantaged and disadvantaged schools approximated that found in the Coleman Report of 1966 to exist between black and white students in the United States. The

21. *Ibid.*, p. 267. 22. *Ibid.*, p. 299, footnote.

Minkovich team found that achievement by the disadvantaged was highest in language, moderate in mathematics, and lowest in geography and science. They also pointed out the existence of two fairly distinct groups of disadvantaged students: one which mastered basic knowledge and skills but not sufficiently to predict success in preparing for the university and the other composed of students who had not mastered the basic knowledge and skills. (By implication, the researchers see little hope that disadvantaged students, on the whole, will qualify to enter universities.)

State secular schools achieve at a higher level than state religious schools. In language achievement, the ratio is 100-75 but in first grade it is 100-85. The latter showing in first grade is attributed by the researchers to the religionists' eagerness for their children to learn to read so they might all the sooner begin studying religious documents. We have already seen a similar explanation for religious schools' superiority in the area of Bible study and achievement. Religious schools spend less time on science and geography (2.2 hours a week vs. 3.8 in secular schools). Their achievement reflects this disparity.

Arab Education in Israel

Writing in mid-1977, Minkovich and colleagues asserted that in the Arab sector of Israeli education "no objective reliable evaluation study has ever been carried out."[23] Six months earlier, Yehuda Bien of Haifa University had produced "the first book ever written on Arab education in Israel."[24] Such prolonged and studied inattention to a considerable educational problem area is itself a commentary on the place of Arab education in Israel.

Arab education cannot be understood in a vacuum. It is closely related to historical, economic, and political conditions that can only be reviewed here in summary fashion. During the formative period of Israel's history, long before independence was attained, little sustained thought was devoted to long-run relations of Arabs and Jews in an independent country.[25] After independence was achieved in 1948, writes Sachar, "for nearly twenty years the Israelis, consciously or unconsciously, had sought to isolate their Arab population from the Middle East, and in their first decade of statehood even to isolate the Arabs from Israeli society at large."[26] At present, the Arab is viewed by large sections of Israeli society as an inferior.[27]

Detailed income statistics for Arabs are not readily available. In the table on page 4, above, it can be seen that non-Jews – 85 percent

23. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
24. Yehuda Bien, *The Arab School. Studies in Human Problems* (Haifa: University of Haifa, December 1976), p. 118.
25. Aahron Cohen, *Israel and the Arab World* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1977).
26. Howard M. Sachar, *A History of Israel From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time* (New York: Knopf, 1976), pp. 537-38.
27. Lecture by Eli Reches, Director of the Shiloah Institute, Tel Aviv University, March 2, 1978.

of whom are Arabs – are exceedingly poor. They are represented proportionately to their total number only in the lowest decile of income. A recent study of housing, made by the Arab Affairs Staff, Public Council for Social Welfare to the Prime Minister's Office, found: ". . . 48.6 percent of all Israelis living in conditions of three to a room were Arabs, as opposed to 9 percent who were Jews. Of those living fewer than 1.5 to a room, 17.6 percent were Arabs, 56.8 percent were Jews."[28]

Population trends among the Arabs suggest a rapid rate of growth. Tel Aviv University's Professor Moshe Hartman has projected that the Arab share of population will rise from its present 15 percent to 40 percent in the year 2000. Should net immigration of Jews fall below 25,000 a year, Hartman noted, the relative Arab share would rise even more. He reported the Jews had an average of 2.7 children per family while the Arab average was 8.5 children.[29]

As Table 1 indicates, Arabs occupy a systematically inferior position in Israeli education. The disparities are least for younger age groups while the Arab presence in post-secondary education is token. Table 2 illustrates the sharp increase in Arab schooling as a whole during the years of Israeli independence. As a result of these changes, school enrollment per 1,000 Arab students aged 6-13 years stood as follows in the 1976-77 school year:[30]

Druzes and others	942.6
Christians	978.8
Muslims	915.2

Much of the expansion of Arab schooling, however, has proceeded unevenly.

During 1976-1977, 746,531 students attended elementary and secondary schools. They were divided as follows: Arabs – 141,397 or 18.9 percent and Jews – 605,134 or 81.1 percent. Table 3 shows a more than proportionate representation of Arab children through seventh grade. Thereafter, there is a sharp drop in Arab enrollment. By the fourth year of high school, the number of Arab students is only one-sixth the number of first graders. By contrast, Jewish students experience only a slight dropout in the last two years of elementary school. The number of Jewish twelfth-graders is nearly half the number of first-graders. By the twelfth grade, the Israeli school system has become almost wholly Jewish, with fewer than 10 percent Arab students.

Class size in Arab primary schools is larger than that in Jewish schools. Between 1959 and 1976, the trend in class size was upward in Arab schools and downward in Jewish schools, as follows:[31]

28. Arthur H. Samuelson, "There Is Another Way," *Judaism* 26 (Fall 1977), p. 409.
29. *Jerusalem Post*, March 3, 1978.
30. *SAOI 1977*, p. 617. 31. *Ibid.*, p. 607.

	1959-1960	1976-1977
Jewish schools	32.6	26.8
Arab schools	29.2	31.3
Arab gap	3.4	4.5

Thus, during the period the two groups of schools shifted position: the number of pupils per class in Jewish schools, which had exceeded that in Arab schools, fell to less than the number in Arab schools. As Table 4 indicates, there are far more large classes in Arab than in Jewish schools:

	Jewish schools	Arab schools
Fewer than 30 pupils	56.7 percent	37.9 percent
More than 30 pupils	43.3 percent	62.1 percent

No data are available to ascertain the direction of the trend.

Another measure of educational progress is the degree to which Arab students successfully complete secondary school and thereby qualify for entrance to a university. Passing of the matriculation examinations marks this successful passage. As Table 5 indicates, during the first two years of independence, no Israeli Arabs matriculated. Then, from 1956 to 1969, Arab matriculants represented a declining percentage. Only since 1970 has the percentage risen to a modest 7.3 percent in 1975.

A long-standing problem of Arab education has been the shortage of qualified teachers. During 1974-1975, qualified teachers in Arab post-primary schools constituted nearly 89 percent of the total. In the more numerous primary schools, however, the percentage of qualified teachers was somewhat less than 48 percent. During the five years between 1969 and 1974, the number of qualified primary school teachers rose only from 45.0 percent to 47.8 percent.[32]

The Minkovich team compared academic achievement between Arab and Jewish schools. Presumably, this section of the report depended heavily upon the contribution of J. Bashi, one of the principal authors of the team report. A total of 3,419 Arab fourth and sixth grade students in 51 schools and 101 classes was studied. Tests were given in Arabic and were judged comparable with those given in Hebrew in Jewish schools. Mathematics tests were "very similar" in both languages. Tests for science and geography were quite different in the two languages.

On language, the researchers report, "there are no significant differences between the two systems . . . in respect to the level of reading comprehension . . ."[33] Indeed, Arab achievement exceeded that of Asian-African Jewish students. In mathematics, the Arab level is lower than it is for science and geography. The general level of Arab achievement in the various subject-matter areas is unsatisfactory as it

32. *Ibid.*, p. 606.
33. Minkovich and others, *An Evaluation Study*, p. 317.

is for Jewish primary schools in general. For Arab schools, however, the gap between curriculum demands and actual achievement is even larger than that for Jewish schools. The Minkovich report calls the situation "a subject for major concern" and "highly unsatisfactory."[34]

In December 1976, Yehuda Bien of Haifa University published a mimeographed study of Arab primary education. His primary interest was in helping teachers and principals see the child as a human being capable of intellectual growth and of individual development. He and his assistants interviewed 582 teachers and principals in 42 schools located in 33 different Arab communities.

Bien points to Jewish-Arab inequalities as basic to an understanding of the Arab teacher:[35]

> Fundamental to this story is a sense of the work of the Arab teacher and his Jewish counterpart. Everyday the Arab educator lives the reality of the difference in teaching content and curriculum, in buildings and services, in the number of pupils he has and how well they are prepared for school. These differences have penetrated his soul, eaten away at his self-image and undermined his capabilities.

Traditionally, teachers in the Arab schools are subordinated to the principal. Indeed, in ordinary discourse, these schools are referred to by the name of their principals.

Bien's researchers found a number of traditional practices in the community and home that bore heavily on the schooling of the young.

Arab mothers and fathers rarely saw their role as informal educators in support of the work of the school. Emotionally, they refrained from demonstrative affection with the children while they were still toddlers. Boys were blatantly favored over girls. During preschool years, it was very rare for a child to receive home instruction in verbal and drawing skills. There was little storytelling, especially with the use of myths and legends. There was much outright misunderstanding of children's behavior. In the school itself, children learned a highly formal "literary" Arabic which was far different from the vernacular Arabic used in the home and on the streets. Teachers were unprepared to remedy this array of deprivations.

Nor were the principals who, according to Bien, "held their faculty in low esteem just as the teachers had no faith in their pupils, and frequently showed them contempt."[36] Unlike principals in the Jewish sector, Arab principals were not accorded power by the Ministry of Education and Culture to decentralize authority and thus enable local initiatives to be made.[37] As a result, "the prevalent image teachers hold of the principal is of a 'servant' of policies imposed on him through supervisory control."[38]

34. *Ibid.*, pp. 319, 321.
35. Bien, *The Arab School*, p. 1.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 36.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 37.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 53.

Teachers do not usually bring their educational problems to the principal. They want help but are afraid to expose their weaknesses. Teachers fear the filing of reprimands in their personnel file. As a result:[39]

> Principals never consult with their teachers and the teachers respond in kind. A mutual lack of communication developed a fertile breeding ground for the symbiosis between patterns of "authority" and the practice of "anarchy."

Teachers work alone and are convinced principals are uninterested in them as individuals. Seldom are teachers urged to take in-service training or to visit other schools. There is little or no contact with the home.

Bien and his colleagues organized a series of workshop sessions for Arab principals in the hope of helping redirect their relationship to teachers and, ultimately, to students. The in-service program was evaluated by Bien and seemed to have had several beneficial results. Principals urged that teachers be involved in the similar training sessions. They also showed greater readiness to share authority with teachers. There was less indication that principals were more considerate of teachers' "capacities and difficulties."[40] Leadership styles were altered in the direction of listening more to teachers' ideas. There were even instances of principals delegating the solution of certain problems to groups of teachers, an unprecedented practice. More new programs and changed procedures were in evidence.

A second group of principals, who studied the workshop experiences, noted that teachers might well interpret the new current of thought as a "trap."[41] Nevertheless, Bien observed otherwise:[42]

> Teachers whose schools had a "cooperative" climate focused their attention on the child and his needs. These teachers sought closer communication with the home and even wanted to establish an educational instruction program.

Many teachers wanted help in teaching, but not until the principal saw the help as an educational asset rather than a work disability.

In another place, Bien noted some effects of the new approach on students. Researchers had found, for example, 435 children in grades 5-8 who were illiterate. Three months of intensive teaching followed. As a result, the children were helped as follows:[43]

> 168 students or 38.5 percent. Problem of illiteracy solved; pupils participate in the usual classroom curriculum.
>
> 87 student or 20.0 percent. Nearly . . . solved; an auxiliary study program still necessary.
>
> 117 students or 27.0 percent. Advancement in basic writing and reading.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 56.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 82. 41. *Ibid.*, p. 83. 42. *Ibid.*, p. 86.
43. Yehuda Bien, *An Advancement Program of the Arab Education in Israel*, The Methodological Center for Adult Education, Givat Haviva, April 6, 1977, p. 8, footnote.

63 students or 14.5 percent. Still fight with barriers of illiteracy. The 435 children constituted from 20 to 30 percent of all students in grades 5-8.

Bien's program of work with principals has been expanded. Instead of individual schools being selected, all schools in a community are to be included.

Integration in Israeli Schools

In Israel, one never hears the word "desegregation." Instead, the word "integration" is used very widely. Consequently, there are few if any discussions of the degree of segregation and the need for desegregating segregated structures. Rather, use of the word "integration" directs one's attention to the ethnic or cultural composition of single classrooms. Another characteristic of Israeli discussion in this area is the reference to the integration of various groups of Jews. Integration of Jew and Arab is almost never mentioned.

Before discussing integration in the schools, let us examine another aspect of integration that is discussed very frequently in Israel. Reference is to "intermarriage" of Asian-African and European-American Jews. These "mixed" marriages constituted 11.8 percent of all marriages in 1955 and 18.9 percent twenty years later. This is an annual growth rate of about one-third of one percent. Following is a breakdown of data on these marriages.

Table 6. JEWISH INTERMARRIAGE, 1955 and 1975

	1955		1975	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Groom from Europe-America who married a bride from Asia-Afica	1,015	7.5	2,915	10.2
Groom from Asia-Africa who married a bride from Europe-America	582	4.3	2,487	8.7
Groom from Europe-America who married a bride from Europe-America	6,549	48.4	10,719	37.5
Groom from Asia-Africa who married a bride from Asia-Africa	5,385	39.8	12,462	43.6
Total	13,531	100.0	28,583	100.0

SOURCE: Basic data in *SAOI 1977*, p. 72. Absolute numbers have been calculated from percentages in the original source.

Note that both the number and percentage of within-Asian-African marriages have increased. Within-European-American

marriage have also increased in number but declined in percentage. The bulk of the increase in intermarriage during recent years represents, apparently, the greater supply of European-American brides for marriage to Asian-African grooms. This may have been a response to selective prosperity among the Asian-Africans.

The public elite of Israel is far from integrated. A recent study by Weingrod and Gurevitch, using 1972 data, found that every one of six spheres of Israeli public life was dominated by persons of European origin, as follows, by percentages:[44]

	Countries of Origin:	
Elite Sectors	Middle East/Africa	Central and Eastern Europe
Political	2.8	48.3
Administrative	2.7	38.9
Economic	4.9	41.5
Academic	4.9	28.7
Professional	1.6	50.8
Artistic-Cultural	0.0	40.5
Total	3.4	39.6

Most of the Middle East/African Jews in "political" positions can be found on local government levels. This reflects the existence of many homogeneous communities.

Several barriers stand in the way of school integration. Demographic barriers are foremost. Many towns and settlements are ethnically homogeneous and were settled originally in this fashion by the government. Another important barrier is the availability of state secular and religious schools. Over 70 percent of the enrollment in the latter schools consists of Asian-African children. Still another obstacle is the uneven distribution among types of high schools. As we saw earlier, relatively few Asian-African children qualify for university entrance. Part of the reason is that these students make up 60 percent of enrollment in vocational high schools but only 30 percent of the academic high schools.[45] Actually, 3 percent fewer Asian-African students were in the latter schools in 1971 than in 1967.[46] In larger cities, culturally and socioeconomically homogeneous neighborhoods are the rule and thus work against school integration.

Nevertheless, Adler estimates that between 20 and 25 percent of elementary students are in integrated classrooms.[47] This has resulted principally from upward social mobility and residential happenstance rather than governmental or school policies. The overall direction of integration has consisted of small numbers of Asian-African children

44. Alex Weingrod and Michael Gurevitch, "Who Are the Israeli Elites?" *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 19 (June 1977), p. 70.
45. Rachel Peleg and Chaim Adler, "Compensatory Education in Israel. Concepts, Attitudes, and Trends," *American Psychologist* 32 (November 1977), p. 952.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 955.
47. Quoted in Susan Bellos, "Parents Say Ministry Reneges on Integration," *Jerusalem Post*, February 21, 1978.

moving into affluent European-American schools. As some Asian-African families move upwards on the economic ladder, their children begin sharing school facilities with those already near the upper rungs.

The Minkovich team referred to "the increasing attempts of municipalities to accelerate integration in schools by redistricting."[48] Detailed information on these attempts is scarce. Recently, however, school integration became a public issue, momentarily. At the center of the issue was a question as to the integration policy of the national government. For seven years children from a poor area of Jerusalem had attended a middle-class school organized by a kibbutz and several other middle-class communities. Apparently, the arrangement had originally been made so that sufficient numbers of children would be available to establish the school. In fall, 1977, the Ministry of Education and Culture reassigned the poorer children to a school attended only by other poor children. The parents protested and the ministry appointed a panel of Hebrew University professors to make recommendations. In January 1978 the committee suggested the transfers be revoked but the ministry refused. Ministry-Director-General Eliezur Shmueli said that integration "could not be imposed."[49] Professor Chaim Adler, panel chairperson, told an interviewer: "What it boils down to is whether the present ministry has a policy of integration or not. If it hasn't, then it should stop telling the public that it supports integration."[50]

The ministry first became centrally involved in integration as a consequence of the School Reform of 1968. This law created a system of junior high schools. One of its aims was to stimulate integration in secondary schools. At present only about one-third of all seventh, eighth, and ninth grade students attend junior high schools; the rest still attend eight-year elementary schools. It appears that the greatest degree of integration occurs in junior high boarding schools. The Minkovich researchers declare flatly that "the Ministry of Education has not espoused any active, systematic policy on integration in the elementary schools."[51]

Teachers' attitudes toward integration were studied by the Minkovich group. Data were gathered through a questionnaire for elementary school teachers. No direct classroom observations were made. Fifteen percent of teachers in disadvantaged schools rejected integration, a view shared by 9 percent of all the teachers. Some three-quarters of teachers thought integration would benefit all kinds of students and raise achievement of the slowest children. Yet, "about half of the teachers in all schools feel that integration will lower the level of achievement of the more gifted students (61 percent) and will increase the feeling of failure of the weaker students forced to compete with the better students."[52] Three-quarters or more of the teachers

48. Minkovich and others, *An Evaluation Study*, p. 349.
49. Quoted in Bellos, *Jerusalem Post*, February 21, 1978.
50. *Ibid.*
51. Minkovich and others, *An Evaluation Study*, p. 362.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 359.

believe integration will improve intergroup relations among the children. A finding that was unexpected, according to the researchers, is that "teachers in the disadvantaged schools exhibit . . . a higher rate of rejection of integration as well as a more pessimistic outlook on the effects of integration in several areas."[53]

Integrated schools were found more likely to have ability grouping. Their principals were more likely to confront serious problems with students; the schools tended to lack time for additional educational work with students needing it; and they suffered from inferior equipment and facilities. While teachers in integrated schools complain more than their peers in other schools, their turnover rate is no higher. Integration does not seem to affect academic achievement of Asian-African children in integrated schools, at least as measured by the Minkovich group.

The Minkovich group's perception of the importance of integration in Israeli society seems to involve a contradiction. A chapter on the subject opens with this sentence: "There is a consensus in Israeli society concerning the desirability of cultural integration in schools."[54] The same chapter closes with the following sentence: ". . . Judging by the input invested in integrated schools, it appears that neither the Ministry of Education, the municipalities, nor the parents consider integration to be a special educational enterprise warranting support and special aid."[55] Since the chapter does not analyze the role of parents, it is difficult to evaluate that part of the second quotation. Otherwise, the closing quotation may be a more realistic characterization than the opening one.

At the end of 1977, a group of twenty-four Israeli and American social scientists published a series of articles on integration in Israel.[56] In light of the present writer's lack of knowledge of the Hebrew language, it was fortunate that the issue of the journal, *Megamot,* carrying the articles also had a twenty-nine-page English summary. Since summaries of a summary are bound to be inadequate, we will emphasize two kinds of articles: (1) those bearing on points treated in the preceding pages, and (2) those dealing with these subjects in an indirect fashion. A number of the articles which will not be discussed here are important in their own right. (It is expected that a full-scale English translation of this issue of *Megamot* will appear in book form in due time.)

S. Smilansky and L. Shephatiah, after studying a total of 2,370 first and second graders in ninety-six classes, concluded:[57]

53. *Ibid.*, p. 361.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 345.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 362.
56. The articles appear in an expanded issue of *Megamot. Behavioural Sciences Quarterly* 23 (December 1977), pp. 1-264. This issue can be obtained for five dollars by writing: The Henrietta Szold Institute, The National Institute for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, 9, Columbia Street, Kiryat Menachem, Jerusalem 96 583, Israel.
57. Sarah Smilansky and Lea Shephatiah, "Socio-Cultural Integration and Other Classroom Variables as Related to Achievement in Grades One and Two," *Megamot* 23 (December 1977), p. x.

> Integration can be highly beneficial in raising the reading achievement (and possibly school-adjustment) of culturally disadvantaged children, while segregation is detrimental . . . In order to maximize the benefit of integrated primary grades, it is recommended that disadvantaged children should receive a preparatory reading program in kindergarten, and that integration should be accompanied by a more individualized approach.

A similar recommendation was made several years ago by American psychologist William D. Rohwer, Jr.[58]

M. Chen, A. Lewy, and D. Kfir studied students in the junior high schools from the viewpoint of interethnic contact. They point out that establishment of the junior high schools after 1968 had not increased interethnic contact by much. For one thing, the ethnic homogeneity of settlements and the division of schools into secular and religious tended to minimize such contact. For another, tracking or ability grouping was a serious obstacle: ". . . The classification of students according to ability for some or all subjects undermined from the beginning the possible positive effects of a heterogeneous classroom in the junior high school . . ."[59] In addition, the junior high school has not reduced the achievement gap or the further education gap between Asian-African and European-American. To some degree, the researchers observe, the values of the European-American are being incorporated within Asian-African students. They cite "a reduction in the degree of ethnic group identification, an increase in the level of aspirations, and a tendency towards a more internal locus of control."[60]

R. Shapira and M. Hadad explored social integration among twelve classes in two Tel Aviv elementary schools of contrasting social circumstances. They found:[61]

> Pupils of European-American origin . . . show a certain preference for ingroup association . . . Pupils of European-American origin reject to a certain degree the efforts of pupils of Asian-American origin to form close bonds of friendship with them.

Children of Asian-African origin, on the other hand, showed no group preference in making friends.

Y. Amir and colleagues examined ethnic attitude change among high school students. They studied 1,033 ninth-grade students in thirty-three classrooms and seven high schools throughout the country. Middle Eastern and Western students answered a questionnaire early

58. See summary of work by Rohwer and associates in Meyer Weinberg, *Minority Students: A Research Appraisal* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977), pp. 77-78.
59. Michael Chen, Arieh Lewy, and Drora Kfir, "The Possibilities of Interethnic Group Contact in the Junior High Schools: Implementation and Results," *Megamot* 23 (December 1977), p. xii.
60. *Ibid.*
61. Rina Shapira and Menachem Hadad, "Commanding Resources and Social Integration," *Megamot* 23 (December 1977), p. xviii.

in the school year and during the last month. Over the school year, Middle Eastern students were more accepting of their own group while Western students were somewhat more ready to select friends from among the other group. No magic number or ratio of one group to the other was found which maximized beneficent ethnic attitudes. Boys of both groups and academically bright students made the most positive changes during the year. The ethnic composition of a student's eighth grade class bore no relationship to her or his attitude change in ninth grade. "Desegregation," concludes the Amir group, "must be accompanied by programs specifically designed to foster ethnic integration, if indeed school desegregation is to make a worthwhile contribution to ethnic relations."[62] The same point is also beginning to penetrate American research on desegregation.

Three articles deal with teacher attitudes.

N. Resh, D. Inbar, and C. Adler interviewed 601 teachers: 90 elementary, 451 junior high school, and 60 high school. High school and religious junior high schools valued academic achievement more than social integration. Junior high teachers are more accepting of the School Reform's contribution to academic achievement than are the other teachers. S. Cahan studied possible teacher discrimination – on cultural grounds – in seventy-nine integrated fourth grade classrooms and found none. Y. Dar, on the other hand, found from his study of six schools that "the teacher's attitudes [toward homogeneous groupings] are influenced by the socio-educational environment in which he performs, and by his experience in a specific pattern of educational organization."[63]

Non-Hebrew readers will anticipate especially the English translation of an article by Z. Klein and Y. Eshel, dealing with the methodology of desegregation studies. They criticize the dominant social-psychological research model which, they point out, is derived from the field of small-group research. They regard it as an inadequate, if not misleading, model:[64]

> On the one hand, it rests on research carried out for the most part in short-term voluntary settings or laboratories which are far removed from the school situation. On the other, the model assumes certain optimal status and ability differences between subgroups that are hardly typical of most integration programs. Moreover, the implied mechanism is one of major personality change that is difficult to account for, to engineer, or to extend easily to the area of improved achievement . . .

62. Yehuda Amir, Shlomo Sharan, Aahron Bizman, Mirian Rivner, and Rachel Ben-Ari, "Personal and Group Factors in the Change of Ethnic Attitudes of Students in Israel High Schools," *Megamot* 23 (December 1977), p. xx.
63. Yehezkel Dar, "Educational Considerations and Social Context Factors Determining Teacher Attitudes Toward Homogeneous Grouping," *Megamot* 23 (December 1977), p. xxviii. See, also, Nora Resh, Dan Inbar, and Chaim Adler, "Teachers' Attitudes Towards Educational Aims and Social Integration," *Megamot* 23 (December 1977), pp. xxv-xxvi, and Sorel Cahan, "Ethnic Discrimination in Teachers' Evaluations of Pupils' Achievements," *Megamot* 23 (December 1977), pp. xxvi-xxvii.
64. Zev Klein and Yochanan Eshel, "Towards a Psycho-Social Definition of School Integration," *Megamot* 23 (December 1977), p. v.

It will be instructive to study the details of this critique and learn of alternative models put forward by the authors. Many similar criticisms could be made of American research on desegregation.

Education and Financial Inequality

During the past four years, the annual rate of inflation in Israel has averaged some 35 percent. Government expenditures on education have risen sharply but as a result of inflation the increases have been severely depreciated. Here, for example, are five categories of such governmental expenditure. (The last, fixed capital formation, refers to construction.) Each year's expenditure is given first in current figures and then in constant figures, that is, taking inflation into account. Amounts are in million Israeli Lira and the constant figures express 1970-1971 prices.[65]

Area of expenditure	Increase in current values, 1971-72 to 1974-75	Increase in constant, 1970-71 prices
Primary schools	652	46
Kindergartens	177	26
Current expenses	2,138	259
Post-secondary, higher education	524	49
Fixed capital expenditure	647	70
Total	4,138	450

Thus, what had seemed like an increase in educational purchases of over 4 billion Israeli Lira became a far more modest 450 million after having been ravaged by inflation. (During spring 1978, the exchange rate was about sixteen Israeli Lira for one American dollar.)

The prices of basic consumer commodities also rose sharply. Food prices, expressed in 1969 prices, rose from 151.1 in 1973 to 420.3 in 1976. Rental housing during the same years rose by a lesser amount (from 154.3 to 303.0) while non-rental housing, the usual form of accommodation, rose from 215.1 to 511.7.[66]

In the face of serious inflation, Israeli families in 1974-1975 spent IL 93 million on textbooks and paper for their children in school.[67] For families with many children, especially those of Asian-African origin, the burden is especially heavy. An estimate made near the close of 1977 suggested that as much as IL 1,500 per primary and junior high school student is expended in the form of expenses and fees.[68] A study in 1974 concluded that Oriental Jewish families earned from 57 to 73 percent of the average income of European-American families.[69] Taking into account the larger size of the former families, it is clear that inflation has especially serious consequences for the education of children from these families.

65. *SAOI 1977*, p. 597. 66. *Ibid.*, p. 236. 67. *Ibid.*, p. 596.
68. See "The Cost of Free Education," *Challenge* 2 (September-October 1977), p. 6.
69. Peleg and Adler, "Compensatory Education in Israel," p. 955.

High schools are an added problem. At present, tuition is charged for the eleventh and twelfth grades. Maximum tuition for the higher grade is IL 6,090 a year. Tuition rates are graded by income. In 1976-1977 about a third of all eleventh and twelfth graders paid no tuition at all.[70] High school students also pay various fees and need to purchase supplies, as indicated above for students in primary and junior high schools.

A movement has long been underfoot in Israel to abolish all tuition in the high school. This movement, however, has collided recently with the need to cut budget expenditures for education. Sharply increased tuition charges would then be a certainty. To avoid such an eventuality, several alternatives have been proposed.

Zevulun Hammer, Minister of Education and Culture, has suggested the abolition of tuition and its replacement by increased payments into the National Insurance system. Principal opposition to the Hammer plan from within the government has been voiced by Labor and Social Affairs Minister Israel Katz and National Insurance Institute Director-General Rafi Roter. They contend that the poorest families pay no tuition now but would have to make the increased insurance payments. The wealthiest families, on the other hand, who now pay full tuition would save money by paying no tuition at all and making a fairly modest insurance payment.[71] The Treasury also opposes the Hammer plan. It favors a national savings plan for parents to cover high school tuition.

Interviews with Israelis

During a recent three-week period, the present writer and two colleagues, Harold and Helen Friedman, correspondents for *Integrateducation*, visited Israel to study inequality in Israeli education. My participation was made possible by a grant from Bernard Ecker and Stewart Grill. We tape-recorded nearly twenty-five hours of interviews. Among the interviewees were academic researchers, school principals, a teachers' union president, a leader of Asian-Africans, the president of a parents' association, the city clerk of the largest Arab city in Israel, the director-general of the education ministry, and others. There is only space enough to report on their responses to topics already covered in earlier pages. No attempt will be made to reproduce the text of entire interviews.

Yehuda Amir, professor of psychology, Bar Ilan University.

Many Middle Eastern children have incorporated within themselves the negative image accorded their group by the larger society. An as-yet-unpublished study of intergroup relations in camp sessions of ten days found a highly positive effect. In another study of

70. *SAOI 1977*, p. 619.
71. See two stories by Susan Belkin, *Jerusalem Post*, February 22 and March 2, 1978.

a boarding school, most of the children were lower-class Middle Easterners. Ten percent were Arabs who participated productively in every aspect of the school's affairs. It is primarily upper middle class Arabs who attend six to eight other boarding schools. A convinced principal is the most important factor in school. Teachers, for the most part, stress cognitive learning and aim at above-average students while feeling selves in conflict over goal of integration.

Amir feels the goals of more integration and increased academic standards are contradictory. He advocates a new emphasis on introducing more non-academic subjects such as art, music and home economics. At present, ninth grade students who do not expect to go on to a university are involved in a watered-down curriculum. In an elite high school in Haifa, reputed to be the best in the country, integration has been abandoned in favor of extreme ability grouping whereby children are sent to other rooms. After one and one-half years of common assignment to the home room, many children do not even know the names of children in the "other" ability groupings. Deliberate discrimination against Asian-African students is minimal and is disappearing. Divisions among students are based on socio-economic status and academic achievement, not ethnicity. The long-run trend in Israeli society is toward the increasing salience of class, not ethnic groups. The upper group of Asian-Africans, Amir predicted, would merge with the Ashkenazi to form a broad middle class. The lower half of the Asian-African, who constitute all but a small part of the Jewish poor, will constitute a lower class.

David Sitton, editor of *Bama'aracha* and *Challenge*, publications of the Sephardi Council of Jerusalem.

He contends that Sephardi children are at a great disadvantage in education. "The Askenazi family has one boy and a dog at home. The Sephardi family has ten children and no dogs." Housing for such families is crowded, and income is low. While tuition reductions and small stipends in high schools help, the situation in higher education is very bad. The government is beginning to revise textbooks and curricula to incorporate the role and contributions of Sephardis to Jewish history. The Sephardi community has been doing some of this research on its own. Government promises to alleviate the conditions of the Sephardis are usually made around election time but not much ever happens after elections.

Joseph Bashi, researcher at Hebrew University.

A co-author of the Minkovich report, Bashi is studying Arab schooling as a whole. Over a third of Arab children fail to reach eighth grade. Except for religion and language, the curriculum of Arab and Jewish schools is the same. From third grade on, Hebrew is a required subject. (In Jewish schools, Arabic is an elective.) No special education classes are given in Arab schools because of their geographic remoteness and the consequent difficulty of concentrating

sufficient numbers of students. Arab schools do not differ greatly as to academic achievement. A number of Arab children are poorer than many disadvantaged Jewish children but they learn more. Arab children are under greater pressure to learn, from their teachers, especially. Homework is required. There are few social activities for Arab children. The average Arab father has completed only 4.5 years of schooling; the Jewish father, 10 years. Interest in education has been growing rapidly among Arabs. While 60 percent of Arab mothers were illiterate, they wanted their children to be educated.

Sarah Zak, president of Tel Aviv Parents Association (P.A.).

The Tel Aviv schools enroll 6 percent of the nation's students. [New York City's schools enroll about 4.5 percent of American students.] All parents belong to the P.A. Membership fees are IL 100 per child. In 1977 the government stopped paying for textbooks and copybooks. In southern Tel Aviv, the poorer section, some lower-class Ashkenazi live. Also, there are some high-income merchants who are unable to give their children help in school subjects. Both groups of parents ask for the best teachers. There is some reason to believe that the schools in the poorer sections do not get the best teachers. During the British Mandate, until 1948, the P.A. provided for nurses in the schools and meals in school. After independence, the municipality took over responsibility.

At present, some 15,000 students (out of a total enrollment of 60,000) are enrolled in the food program; some of them pay nothing. These lower-class and lower-middle-class children tend to be concentrated in some suburbs. A free uniform for 5,000 children is provided by P.A. One day a year, junior high school children throughout the city go door-to-door to collect money for various P.A. activities. Integration involves one-way movement of poor children to more advantaged junior high schools. Kindergarten for three and four-year-olds cost IL 350 per month per child. Day-care centers cost IL 800 per month per child. This is very expensive for a working woman who also has to employ some household help. Poor families get reduced tuition rates or, in some cases, no tuition is charged. In Jaffa there are two Arab schools, one elementary and one high school. Parents of these children participate in the P.A. A number of Arabs are active in the national P.A. School principals in general do not welcome P.A. participation. One reason is that the P.A. files complaints against specific schools with the Education Ministry's inspector who then makes a personal investigation.

Dr. Azfrira Ashkenazi, psychiatrist and director of a child development center in Beer-Sheba, associated with Ben-Gurion University.

During the past four or five years, the education of Oriental Jewish children has improved somewhat. Actually, most teachers of young children stress noncognitive learning rather than academic

achievement. The innovations of recent years stress not the teaching of academic skills but a reorganized process of education. There is much discussion of activity classes in which there is very little real meeting of special problems of individual children. Even group teaching, another prominent innovation, divides children into small groups; these are often the same children who would do well in any other arrangement. The junior high reform has universalized ability grouping.

The Development Center enrolls children up to five years of age who are severely retarded or rejected at home. A staff of psychologists, social workers, and therapists provide services. A majority of referrals to the Center are children of Asian-African origin. Dr. Ashkenazi stressed the centrality of language mastery in social life. Among the most deficient of all groups in this regard are Benê Israel children from India whose families speak little Hebrew or, in fact, little of any Indian language. Concentrated in Dimona, the children are severely deprived of verbal interaction. In the clinic, children up to three years old from this group have a vocabulary of twenty words. Their families are extremely poor and seem to lack interest in "rising" in Israeli society.

Dr. Ashkenazi advocates setting up day-care centers for children starting at eighteen months of age. These centers should teach language skills, preacademic skills, and attention skills as well as the art of sitting in one place for an extended time. Present day-care centers are principally physical care centers, operated by untrained personnel, and are unconcerned with preparing children to function well. At the other end of the school range, that is, high school, the critical problem for Oriental children is not lack of money to pay tuition but the acquisition of academic skills. She advocates abolishing family allowances since so much of the income is spent on luxuries, and would shift the funds into day-care centers.

Sholem Levin, secretary, Israeli Teachers' Union, Tel Aviv.

In 1968 the Union opposed the Junior High School Reform because it feared the educational consequences of breaking up the eight-year elementary school. It also opposed the desegregation aspect on two grounds: (1) it was not done the right way and (2) it should have begun with students at an earlier age. The union's worst fears have proved justified, Levin claimed. In eight years or so, fewer than half the eligible children attend junior high schools. Desegregation is lagging. He opposes "using integration to achieve integration." Disadvantaged children from poor homes must be prepared before desegregation to interact with children from middleclass homes. A proper step would be to integrate the primary schools first.

Junior high schools have two statutory goals: improve academic achievement and achieve classroom integration. These, according to

Levin, are contradictory. He compared the integrated classroom with a convoy of ships which is paced by the slowest vessel. For greater achievement, Levin insisted, children must be separated. The schools must opt for academic achievement over integration, he insisted. His impression was that the academic gap between Ashkenazi and Sephardi was growing in the junior high schools. Little or no mobility existed between tracks in junior high school. The teachers' union would support integration brought about by changing attendance boundaries of individual schools.

Parents, he warned, must not be pressed too hard on the integration issue. The achievement of integration was an organic process, not a military operation. Patience was needed. Integration should be sought in evolutionary ways. To integrationists, he warned: Don't mobilize forces against you. Parents on kibbutzim, he said, were no different. They also resisted integration with children from outside the kibbutzim since they want to give their own children an education specially fitted for kibbutz life. Don't press the kibbutzniks to give up their special character.

The Union is an integrated organization. Eighty-five percent of its members are Jews and the remainder Arabs. Three-quarters of the Jewish members are Ashkenazis.

Solomon Grabois, Dean of Humanities, University of Haifa.

Professor Grabois, a specialist in medieval history, is administering a program of research and teaching on the culture and society of Oriental Jews in countries of origin and in Israel. A grant from the Ministry of Education and Culture pays for the program. Two full-time and three part-time faculty members are involved. [The national program, financed at about $1 million, exists at a number of universities.] At Haifa, research is going on into: (1) Hebrew and Arab language interrelations; (2) the history of the Iraqi Jewish community and society; and (3) the modernization of North African Jewry, including acculturation to French society. A separate study is being made of oral communication patterns between mothers and children. In applied research, within five or six years they hope to produce some thirty monographs for use by primary, high school and teachers' college staff. Next year the first one is due, on the Moroccan Jewish community.

Three undergraduate courses are being offered. One, enrolling thirty-one students, is a general introduction to the history of Oriental Jews. A second, which enrolls 150 and is a required course, deals with the emergence of Oriental Jewish communities in seventeenth and eighteenth century Israel. Another deals with the literature of North African Jews; it enrolls twenty-five students. An advanced seminar is studying the literature of Egyptian Jewry.

Professor Grabois emphasizes that the program is not designed as a concession to Oriental Jews. Rather, it is a national benefit. He also cautions that history is not enough, so to speak. Attention must also be paid to bridging the social and economic gap between Oriental and other Jews. Also, school integration has an important role to play.

Concluding Observations

Israeli academics frequently caution American visitors not to approach problems of inequality in the schools with the model of American blacks in mind. The Israeli schools must be appraised in their own terms. This seems to be another way of saying that inequality in Israeli schools is not racial but social, cultural, or in the case of the Arabs, national. Yet, an American observer finds a good deal that is familiar and unsurprising.

A pervasive class bias characterizes Israeli education, much as it does in the United States. Minkovich expresses the same view when he writes that "in Israel, as in most countries, educational disadvantage is related to socioeconomic status . . . and to membership in cultural groups."[72] In the primary schools differential achievement by socio-economic and cultural group is a powerful pattern. The magnitude of the gap between some groups of Jews matches that between blacks and whites in the United States. Segregation within the Jewish groups is also based on widespread housing segregation. Contrary to a generally held conviction, as we have seen, Asian-Africans as a whole are tending more to marry within their own group.

Compensatory education operates chiefly in the primary schools but it is based on what Minkovich calls the "educational learning" aspect. That is, the low-achieving child is viewed as an individual learner who is failing to learn the accepted lessons in the way they are taught. What Minkovich calls the "social-political" aspect is the problem of abolishing the achievement gap between groups. The resources sufficient for such a task can only, of course, be generated outside the schools. It is questionable whether the national government wishes to undertake or is capable of undertaking such a task. With the resources presently available, compensatory education programs are unevenly implemented, often, as we have seen, in favor of groups of children least in need of help. Compensatory education in secondary schools is infrequently available. On the university level, a pre-freshman period of study is sometimes offered.

Arab education is a large problem area. Part of the work to be done is catching up. Independence bequeathed few Arab primary schools and virtually no secondary schools. But certain other inequalities have been permitted to proceed. Class size is one of these.

72. Minkovich and others, *An Evaluation Study*, p. 13.

Another is the inapplicability of the welfare program to Arab schools; it is used only in Jewish schools. Persistent failure to supply all Arab primary schools with qualified teachers is a critical area for improvement. The recent establishment of a second Arab teachers college will alleviate the problem.

Integration is a minor trend in Israeli education. There is no constitutional imperative to desegregate nor any mass movement to infuse a sense of urgency. It is viewed by many educators as one of the less effective forms of compensatory education. In a few municipalities – Jerusalem is one discussed earlier – governmental initiatives are evident. Adherence to the goal of integration is anything but narrow. Yet, the practice of integration is minimal.

Table 1. YEARS OF SCHOOLING, JEWS AND NON-JEWS, BY AGE GROUP, 1976

	Years of Schooling:											
	0		1-4		5-8		9-12		13-15		16+	
Age Group	Jews	Non-Jews	Jews	Non-Jews	Jews	Non-Jews	Jews	Non-Jews	Jews	Non-Jews	Jews	Non-Jews
14-17	0.3	2.4	0.4	3.8	17.4	41.8	81.3	51.9	0.6	0.1	—	—
18-34	1.0	10.2	1.0	10.3	19.0	46.2	54.0	25.4	16.4	6.0	8.6	1.9
35-54	10.4	36.8	6.3	21.3	31.4	31.1	34.4	8.3	9.0	1.2	8.5	1.3
55-64	13.6	64.1	7.0	16.3	34.7	14.4	31.5	4.6	7.4	—	5.8	0.6
65+	19.8	76.1	11.7	14.4	33.3	6.7	24.6	1.7	5.2	0.6	5.4	0.5

SOURCE: *Statistical Abstract of Israel* (Tel Aviv: Central Bureau of Statistics, November 1977), p. 593. (Hereafter referred to as *SAOI 1977*.)

Table 2. NUMBER OF PUPILS IN SCHOOLS, JEWS AND ARABS, 1948 and 1976-1977

	Jews		Arabs	
Level	1948	1976-1977	1948	1976-1977
Kindergarten	25,406	147,898	1,124	16,965
Primary schools	91,133	398,394	9,991	112,753
Intermediate schools	—	60,269	—	10,261
Post-primary schools	10,218	134,731	14	17,653
Secondary schools	7,168	56,796	14	14,890
Teacher training colleges	713	11,740	—	730

SOURCE: *SAOI 1977*, p. 602.

Table 3. ARAB AND JEWISH PUPILS, 1976-1977

Grade	Arabs			Jews		
	Number enrolled	Percent of total enrollment in grade	Percent of enrollment in 1st grade	Number enrolled	Percent of total enrollment in grade	Percent of enrollment in 1st grade
1	18,057	22.5	100.0	62,096	77.5	100.0
2	16,822	22.4	93.2	58,311	77.6	93.9
3	15,422	21.7	85.4	55,656	78.3	89.6
4	15,208	22.2	84.2	53,419	77.8	86.0
5	15,172	22.2	84.0	53,128	77.8	85.6
6	14,736	21.8	81.6	52,983	78.2	85.3
7	12,873	19.5	71.3	53,309	80.5	85.8
8	10,923	17.7	60.5	50,867	82.3	81.9
9	8,637	15.5	47.8	47,244	84.5	76.1
10	4,800	10.5	26.6	40,965	89.5	66.0
11	3,963	10.3	21.9	34,555	89.7	55.6
12	3,085	9.8	17.1	28,444	90.2	45.8

SOURCE: Basic data in *SAOI 1977*, pp. 608-09.

Table 4. NUMBER OF PUPILS PER CLASS, JEWISH AND ARAB PRIMARY SCHOOLS, 1975-1976

Number of pupils per class	Classes in Jewish Schools		Classes in Arab Schools	
	Number of classes	Percent of classes	Number of classes	Percent of classes
1-9	520	3.6	53	1.5
10-14	1,213	8.5	96	2.7
15-19	1,313	9.2	159	4.5
20-24	2,305	16.1	420	11.9
25-29	2,753	19.3	610	17.3
30-34	3,135	22.0	938	26.6
35-39	2,491	17.5	827	23.4
40-44	537	3.8	338	9.6
45-49	6	—	54	1.5
50+	2	—	35	1.0
Total	14,275	100.0	3,530	100.0

SOURCE: Basic data in *SAOI 1977*, p. 610.

Table 5.

JEWISH AND ARAB GRADUATES OF MATRICULATION EXAMINATIONS, 1948-1975, SELECTED YEARS

Year	Jew	Arabs	Total	Arabs as Percent of Total
1948-1949	802	—	802	0.0
1950-1951	865	—	942	0.0
1956-1957	2,540	77	2,981	2.6
1960-1961	3,238	94	3,558	2.6
1964-1965	7,646	147	8,539	1.7
1969-1970	9,058	212	11,043	1.9
1970-1971	9,760	340	11,843	2.9
1971-1972	9,630	486	11,955	4.1
1974-1975	10,100	780	12,810	6.1
1975-1976	10,200	970	13,320	7.3

SOURCE: Basic data in *SAOI 1977*, p. 619.

Works Cited

Amir, Yehuda; Sharan, Shlomo; Bizman, Aahron; Rivner, Marian and Ben-Ari, Rachel. "Personal and Group Factors in the Change of Ethnic Attitudes of Students in Israel High Schools." *Megamot* 23 (December 1977).

Bellos, Susan. "Parents Say Ministry Reneges on Integration." *Jerusalem Post*, February 21, 1978.

Bien, Yehuda. *An Advancement Program of the Arab Education in Israel.* The Methodological Center for Adult Education, Givat Haviva, April 6, 1977.

———. *The Arab School. Studies in Human Problems.* Haifa: University of Haifa, December 1976.

Cahan, Sorel. "Ethnic Discrimination in Teachers' Evaluations of Pupils' Achievements." *Megamot* 23 (December 1977).

Chen, Michael; Lewy, and Kfir, Drora. "The Possibilities of Interethnic Group Contact in the Junior High Schools: Implementation and Results." *Megamot* 23 (December 1977).

Cohen, Aahron. *Israel and the Arab World.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1977.

"The Cost of Free Education." *Challenge* 2 (September-October 1977).

Dar, Yehezkel. "Educational Considerations and Social Context Factors Determining Teacher Attitudes Toward Homogeneous Grouping." *Megamot* 23 (December 1977).

Jerusalem Post, March 3, 1978.

Klein, Zev, and Eshel, Yochanan. "Towards a Psycho-Social Definition of School Integration. *Megamot* 23 (December 1977).

Megamot. Behavioural Sciences Quarterly 23 (December 1977).

Minkovich, A. *An Evaluation Study of Israeli Elementary Schools.* Jerusalem: Hebrew University, June 1977.

Peleg, Rachel, and Adler, Chaim. "Compensatory Education in Israel. Concepts, Attitudes, and Trends." *American Psychologist* 32 (November 1977).

Reches, Eli. Lecture. March 2, 1978, ZOA House, Tel Aviv.

Resh, Nora; Inbar, Dan; and Adler, Chaim. "Teachers' Attitudes Towards Educational Aims and Social Integration." *Megamot* 23 (December 1977).

Sachar, Howard M. *A History of Israel From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time.* New York: Knopf, 1976.

Samuelson, Arthur H. "There Is Another Way." *Judaism* 26 (Fall 1977).

Shapira, Rina, and Hadad, Menachem. "Commanding Resources and Social Integration." *Megamot* 23 (December 1977).

Smilansky, Sarah, and Shephatiah, Lea. "Socio-Cultural Integration and Other Classroom Variables as Related to Achievement in Grades One and Two." *Megamot* 23 (December 1977).

Statistical Abstract of Israel 1977. Tel Aviv: Central Bureau of Statistics, November 1977.

Weinberg, Meyer. *Minority Students: A Research Appraisal*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977.

Weingrod, Alex, and Gurevitch, Michael. "Who Are the Israeli Elites?" *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 19 (June 1977).

A Chance to Learn:

The History of Race and Education in the United States

Meyer Weinberg

Published by Cambridge University Press.

A full-scale history of the education of black, Mexican-American, American Indian and Puerto Rican children. Covers higher education as well as elementary and secondary schools.

contents

Part I Elementary and secondary education

1 The system of compulsory ignorance: black children to 1865
2 Separate and unequal: black education, 1865-1950
3 Struggle for public policy: black children since 1950
4 Mexican-American children: the neighbors within
5 Indian-American children
6 Puerto Rican children

II Higher education

7 Guarded preserve: black students in higher education
8 Higher education for other minorities

III Conclusions

9 To educate all the children of all the people

Mail your order to:

Center for Equal Education
School of Education, Northwestern University
2003 Sheridan Road
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Hardcover - $27.50 Paper - $6.95
(Please enclose 75c for postage.)